



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/518,349	03/03/2000	Cary Lane Rohwer	ST9-99-128	5134

25696 7590 05/09/2003

OPPENHEIMER WOLFF & DONNELLY
P. O. BOX 10356
PALO ALTO, CA 94303

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

CHOWDHARY, ANITA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2153	[REDACTED]

DATE MAILED: 05/09/2003

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/518,349	ROHWER, CARY LANE	
	Examiner Anita Choudhary	Art Unit 2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 March 2003.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
- 4) Claim(s) 1-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 03 March 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The amendment filed on March 4, 2003 under 37 CFR 1.312 has been entered. Claims 1, 9, 19, 27, 37, and 44 have been amended and are presented for further examination. Claims 1-53 are presented.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-53 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 19- 22 and 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sequeira (US Patent 6,222,530) in view of Bowman-Amuah (US Patent 6,332,163) hereinafter Bowman, in further view of Fu et al (US Patent 5,845,257), hereinafter referred to as Fu.

Sequeira shows a system and method for a master scheduler for assisting client in viewing stored media at scheduled times. In referring to claim 1:

- Master Scheduler node (fig. 1, 120) receives information input by user specifying a selected one of the media servers for scheduling operations to be performed (col. 3 line 60 - col. 4 line col. 5 line 5).
- Displaying graphical information indicative of times at selected media server (fig. 6 col. 14 lines 4-27).

Although Sequeira shows substantial features of the claimed invention, Sequeira does not particularly point out the node and server being in different time zones. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art, and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Sequeira, as evidenced by Bowman.

In an analogous art, Bowman discloses a communications service for providing information over a computer network to clients. Part of Bowman's disclosure shows communications between a node and a server residing on different time zones from one another (col. 104 lines 55- col. 105 line 9).

Given this feature, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system disclosed by Sequeira by employing the feature shown by Bowman in order for clients to interact with servers distributed in various regions throughout the world.

Although Sequeira in view of Bowman shows substantial features of the claimed invention, neither explicitly shows the displaying of current local time of the server in the different time zone. Nonetheless showing current local time of a remote location is well known in the art, and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Sequeira in view of Bowman, as evidenced by Fu.

In an analogous art, Fu shows a system for displaying scheduling and tracking events across multiple time zones. Fu discloses displaying current local time of a remote location in a different time zone (col. 4 line 54- col. 5 line 27).

Given this feature, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system disclosed by Sequeira in view of Bowman, by employing the system shown by Fu, in order to better schedule events in different time zones for a traveling user.

In referring to claim 2, 20 and 38, Sequeira shows:

- The displaying of GUI at node including a plurality of interface components enabling a user to specify and schedule operations to be performed by selected ones of the media servers (col. 5 lines 38- col. 7 lines 15).
- The receiving of information input by the user specifying an operation to be performed by the selected media server, and a schedule for performing the operations (col. 14 lines 4-49).

In referring to claim 3, 21, and 39, Sequeira shows a media storage device attached to media server for storing media data. User is enabled to select preferred media from said attached media storage device corresponding to selected media server (fig. 1 item 160, col. 4 lines 7-13, col. 8 line 57- col. 8 line 5).

In referring to claim 4, 22, and 40, Sequeira shows the network being IP network (col. 4 lines 39-47, col. 10 lines 14-18).

Claims 5, 6, 23, 24, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sequeira in view Bowman in further view of Fu, in relation to claims 1-4, 19- 22 and 37-40; and in further view of Lindblad et al.

Although Sequeira in view of Bowman in further view of Fu, shows substantial features of the claimed invention, they do not explicitly show an applet being sent to terminal. Nonetheless an applet being sent to terminal via network is well known and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Sequeira in view of Bowman and in further view of Fu, as evidenced by Lindblad.

Lindblad teaches as video on demand applet method for access to multimedia documents. In referring to claim 5 and 23, Lindblad shows applet transmitted to terminal via network for display in at terminal window (col. 3 lines 25-48, col. 5 lines 5-26).

Given the teachings of Lindblad, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and the advantages of modifying Sequeira in view of Bowman and in further view of Fu, by using an applet in order to request and control multimedia document streams from video server.

In referring to claim 6, 24, and 41 Lindblad shows multicasting operations for streaming media to terminals, and the encoding of media data (col. 8 lines 1-9, col. 6 lines 25-29).

Claims 7, 8, 25, 26, 42, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sequeira in view of Bowman and in further view of Fu, in relation to claims 1-4, 19- 22, and 37-40 and in further view of Maskowitz et al.

Sequeira in view of Bowman and in further view of Fu, show substantial features of the claimed invention including:

- Display a source selection interface enabling user to select a source location, resulting in receiving information input by user (Sequeira, col. 6 lines 41-51, fig 3A item 310)
- Displaying an asset list and receiving input by user (Sequeira, col. 10 lines 14-40 fig. 32A 3201g).

Sequeira in view of Bowman and in further view of Fu, do not show destination selection interface of assets being portions. Nonetheless these features are well known and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Sequeira in view of Bowman and in further view of Fu, as evidenced by Moskowitz.

In an analogous art, Moskowitz teaches a viewer controllable on demand multimedia service having:

- Allowing user to arrange the delivery of media data to a destination device (col. 4 lines 10-20, 55-60).

Given the teachings of Moskowitz, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages to modifying Sequeira in view of Bowman and in further view of Fu, with a destination selection component as disclosed by Moskowitz in order serve a selected media event to a virtually unlimited number of subscribers.

In regards to claim 8, 26 and 43, Sequeira shows displaying scheduled copy interface components enabling user to select a start time and date for copying, and generating a copy command associated with the start time and date of selected source (fig. 7 col. 14 lines 28-32).

Claim 9-16, 27-34, and 44-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sequeira in view of Bowman and in further view of Fu, in view of Lindblad in referring to claims 5, 6, 23, 24, and 41 and in further view of Morris.

Although Sequeira, Bowman and Fu in view of Lindblad show substantial features of the claimed invention, they do not show a multimedia device operative to generate multimedia data. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Sequeira, Bowman and Fu in view of Lindblad as evidenced by Morris.

In analogous art, Morris shows method and system for allowing control of multimedia device over a network.

In referring to claim 9, 27, and 44, Morris shows a multimedia device operative to generate media data, such device linked to server (col. 15 lines 36- col. 16 line 25).

Given the teachings of Morris a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages to modifying the Sequeira and Bowman in view of Lindblad with a multimedia device to generate the media data in order to allow remote access and control of media devices for the purposes of imaging and surveillance applications.

In referring to claim 10, 28, and 45 Sequeira shows a display interface for enabling user to select a start time and date for encoding of operations (fig. 7 col. 14 lines 28-32). Lindblad further shows the encoding of such requested data associated with client request (col. 6 lines 18-32).

In referring to claim 11, 29, and 46, Sequeira shows a first option of selecting stop date and time, and second option including duration and start time (fig. 32A/B, col. 21 liens 15-30).

In referring to claim 12, 30, and 47, Sequeira shows the recording of media data to a memory location on a server, a display is used to register the client and camera (col. 15 lines 57-col. 16 line 26).

In referring to claim 13, 31, and 48, Sequeira shows a display for user to select playback destination and schedule (fig. 23, col. 19 lines 1-67).

In referring to claim 14, 32, and 49, Sequeira shows a play back schedule having a first and second group of components enabling user to selecting start time and date as well as options for play-back, (fig. 7 col. 14 lines 28-32, fig. 32A/B, col. 21 liens 15-30).

In referring to claim 15, 33, and 50, Lindblad shows loop count value for repeat of streaming of sorted media (col. 8 lines 1-9).

In referring to claim 16, 34 and 51, Sequeira shows an event notification message (col. 9 lines 33-42).

Claim 17-18, 35, 36, 52 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sequeira in view of Bowman and in further view of Fu, and in further view of Monteiro et al.

Although Sequeira in view of Bowman and in further view of Fu, show substantial features of the claimed invention Sequeira in view of Bowman and in further view of Fu, do not show displaying multicasting destination interface information. Nonetheless this feature is well known and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Sequeira in view of Bowman and in further view of Fu, as evidenced by Monteiro et al.

In an analogous art, Monteiro shows multicasting of media data and display of selections for multicast broadcasts (col. 16 lines 20- col. 17 line 30).

Given the teachings of Monteiro a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Sequeira in view of Bowman and in further view of Fu, by using a display for multicasting media data to a plurality of users at the same time in order carryout multi-party conferencing of data and images.

In referring to claim 18, 36, and 53, Sequeira shows a first and second group of components allowing user to select start time and date for and other options for schedule duration (fig. 7 col. 14 lines 28-32, fig. 32A/B, col. 21 liens 15-30).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anita Choudhary whose telephone number is (703) 305-5268. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

AC
April 26, 2003



GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100